



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/395,909	09/14/1999	ANDERS UVLIDEN	44559-00003	6655

7590 10/09/2003

STANLEY R MOORE  
JENKENS & GILCHRIST PC  
3200 FOUNTAIN PLACE  
1445 ROSS AVE  
DALLAS, TX 752022799

EXAMINER

ARMSTRONG, ANGELA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

15

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/395,909

Applicant(s)

UVLIDEN ET AL.

Examiner

Angela A. Armstrong

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 7-14, 16-19, 21-22, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adoul et al (US Patent No. 5,754,976) in view of Ubale et al (US Patent No. 5,778,335).

3. Regarding claims 1-3, 8-9, 12-14, 17-19, 22, and 25-26, at col. 10, line 21 continuing to col. 12, line 10, Adoul et al discloses the basic principles of the Code-excited linear prediction (CELP) coding method, which is based on an analysis by synthesis method. Adoul et al teaches that the CELP synthesizer consists of long term predictor and short-term predictor and the output of the codebook is scaled by a gain and sent to the predictors. At col. 12, lines 24-24 and col. 14, line 27 continuing to col. 15, line 7, Adoul teaches that the search complexity is drastically reduced by restraining the subset of code vectors being searched to code vectors of which a certain number of non-zero amplitude pulses meet a pre-determined criteria, which reads on “selecting, for each signal block, a corresponding excitation codebook identification from a pre-determined, signal block independent sequence of codebook identifications.”

Art Unit: 2654

Adoul does not specifically teach the system provides for a multi-codebook CELP coding/decoding system. However, implementation of multiple codebooks in a CELP coding/decoding scheme was well known in the art.

In a similar field of endeavor, Ubale discloses a method and apparatus for efficient multiband CELP wideband speech and music coding and decoding. Specifically, at col. 6, lines 20-28 Ubale discloses implementation of multiple excitation codebooks in the CELP encoder, and specifically suggests that use of more than one excitation codebook results in better speech and music quality.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the CELP encoding teachings of Adoul to implement multiple excitation codebooks as taught by Ubale, for the purpose of achieving better audio quality from the encoder.

4. Regarding claims 10 and 11, Adoul et al discloses that the CELP coder is used to process blocks of speech col. 10, lines 21-22.

5. Regarding claims 7, 16, 21, and 24, at col. 14, line 27 continuing to col. 15, line 7, Adoul teaches that the search complexity is drastically reduced by restraining the subset of code vectors being searched to code vectors of which a certain number of non-zero amplitude pulses meet a pre-determined criteria, which reads on “pseudo-random stepping or selection”, since the pre-determined criteria changes, the set of code vectors which meet the criteria will change, and thus the selection is pseudo-random.

Art Unit: 2654

6. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adoul in view of Ubale, and further in view of Heidari et al (US Patent No. 6,055,496).

7. Regarding claims 4 and 5, Adoul and Ubale teach everything as claimed in claim 3. Adoul and Ubale do not specifically teach of channel-protected parameters with error detection. However, implementation of channel-protected parameters was well known.

In a similar field of endeavor, Heidari teaches a CELP speech coder to improve overall system capacity (col. 2, lines 47-49, which implements channel coding that provides error protection (col. 2, lines 64-66).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of invention to modify the CELP coding system of Adoul and implement channel coding which provides error protection, as taught by Heidari et al, for the purpose of improving overall system capacity, as suggested by Heidari et al.

8. Claims 6, 15, 20, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adoul in view of Ubale, and further in view of Deller et al (1987, Discrete-Time Processing of Speech Signals).

9. Regarding claims 6, 15, 20, and 23 Adoul and Ubale do not specifically teach the codebook selector cyclically steps through the codebook identification. However, cyclically processing for selecting codebook identifications for speech coding was well known in the art.

In a similar field of endeavor, at pages 480-482, Deller et al discloses the basic principles of the Code-excited linear prediction (CELP) coding method, which is based on an analysis by

Art Unit: 2654

synthesis method. Deller et al teaches that the CELP synthesizer consists of long term predictor and short-term predictor and the output of the codebook is scaled by a gain and sent to the predictors. Additionally, at page 481, Deller et al discloses that the system performs an exhaustive search for finding the sequence that minimizes the error energy, which reads on the cyclically stepping through the sets of codebooks.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify the coding system of Adoul to implement cyclically processing for selection from the codebook as suggested by Deller et al, for the purpose of finding the best sequence that minimizes the error energy, as also suggested by Deller et al.

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2654

***Conclusion***

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angela A. Armstrong whose telephone number is 703-308-6258.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (703) 305-9645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Angela A. Armstrong  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2654

  
**RICHEMOND DORVIL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

AAA  
October 4, 2003